

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application. No claims have been canceled. Claims 1-2, 4-8, 15, 17, 19, and 21-54 have been amended to more properly define preexisting claim limitations and are supported by the specification.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 2, 4, 5, 8, 22, 24, 25, 28, 36, 39, 46 and 49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention.

Applicant submits that claims 2, 4, 5, 8, 22, 24, 25, 28, 36, 39, 46 and 49, as amended, overcome the rejection. No new matter has been added. One of ordinary skill in the art will recognize that the Telalert system is one example of a messaging application as claimed. Accordingly, Applicant requests the rejection to claims 2, 4, 5, 8, 22, 24, 25, 28, 36, 39, 46 and 49 under 35 USC §112 be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 9-21, 23, 25-27, 29-35, 37, 38, 40, 41, 43-45, 47, 48, 50, 51, 53 and 54 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,219,648 of Jones et al. (“Jones”).

Jones discloses “the PUMBA application 26 may include two configuration files for each service center. The configuration files can also be stored on the mainframe along with the PUMBA executable files. When monitoring each data record, the two

configuration files (i.e., the "center data file" and the "center alert file") must match the service center name provided in the header of the data record or ticket. Thus, the service center name must be part of the data record sent to the manager module. According to a preferred embodiment of the present invention, each of the configuration files may be edited while the PUMBA application is active, and the editing changes may become effective when the next report, after the files are updated, is received by the parsing module. The service centers may edit their files by connecting with the mainframe 20 (e.g. by TELNET) and by using an editor." (See Jones, column 13, lines 38-53).

Applicant submits that Jones does not disclose each and every element as claimed. Specifically, Applicant submits that Jones does not disclose the generation of a text-based configuration file containing configuration information extracted from a database, as claimed in independent claims 1, 21, 34, and 45. Rather, Jones discloses that a PUMBA application may include two configuration files that may be edited using an editor. The manual editing of information into the configuration files, as disclosed in Jones, is not the same as the generation of a text-based configuration file containing configuration information extracted from a database, as claimed. Editing a text-based configuration file with an editor, for example, will not detect errors when modifying the files and thereby compromises the integrity of the messaging system. In some cases, inconsistency in the configuration information may not be discovered until after an alert message fails to alert the necessary contact and thereby delays a response.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Jones does not disclose the limitations of generating a text-based configuration file containing the extracted configuration information as recited in claims 1, 21, 34, and 45. Claims 3, 6-7, 9-12, 23, 25-27, 29-33, 35, 37-38, 40-41, 43-44, 47-48, 50-51 and 53-54 are dependent one at least

one of the claims 1, 21, 34, and 45, and hence, are patentable at least for the reasons stated above. Therefore, Applicant requests the rejections to claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 9-21, 23, 25-27, 29-35, 37, 38, 40, 41, 43-45, 47, 48, 50, 51, 53 and 54 under 35 USC §102(e) be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 2, 4, 8, 22, 24, 28, 36, 39, 46 and 49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,219,648 of Jones et al. (“Jones”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,442,547 of Bowman-Amuah (“Bowman-Amuah”).

As articulated above, claims 1, 21, 34, and 45 are patentable over Jones. Bowman-Amuah fails to cure the underlying deficiencies of Jones including the failure to disclose the limitations of generating a text-based configuration file containing the extracted configuration information, as claimed. Claims 2, 4, 8, 22, 24, 28, 36, 39, 46 and 49 are dependent on at least one of the claims 1, 21, 34, and 45, and hence, are patentable at least for the reasons stated above. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the combination do not disclose or suggest each and every element of claims 2, 4, 8, 22, 24, 28, 36, 39, 46 and 49. Therefore, Applicant requests the rejection to the claims under 35 USC §103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 5 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,219,648 of Jones et al. (“Jones”) in view of Applicant’s admitted prior art.

As articulated above, claims 1 and 21 are patentable over Jones for failing to disclose the limitations of generating a text-based configuration file containing the

extracted configuration information, as claimed. Claims 5 and 25 are dependent on at least one of the claims 1 and 21 and hence, are patentable at least for the reasons stated above. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the combination does not disclose or suggest each and every element of claims 5 and 25. Therefore, Applicant requests the rejection to the claims under 35 USC §103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 42 and 52 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,219,648 of Jones et al. (“Jones”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,288,688 of Hughes et al. (“Hughes”)

As articulated above, claims 34 and 45 are patentable over Jones. Hughes fails to cure the underlying deficiencies of Jones including the failure to disclose the limitations of generating a text-based configuration file containing the extracted configuration information, as claimed. Claims 42 and 52 are dependent on at least one of the claims 34 and 45, and hence, are patentable at least for the reasons stated above. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the combination does not disclose or suggest each and every element of claims 42 and 52. Therefore, Applicant requests the rejection to the claims under 35 USC §103(a) be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections have been overcome by the amendments and remarks, and that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the rejections be withdrawn and the pending claims be allowed.

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666
for any fee deficiency that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: August 16, 2004


André Gibbs
Reg. No. 47,593

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300